

B1. DESIGN EXCELLENCE PROGRAM GUIDELINES



THE TRUE
UNIVERSITY OF
THESE DAYS IS A
COLLECTION OF BOOKS

SAN FRANCISCO PUBLIC LIBRARY
BRANCH LIBRARY IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM

DESIGN EXCELLENCE PROGRAM GUIDELINES

MAY 2002, APRIL 2003, MARCH 2004, DECEMBER 2007

INVITATION

Our public library buildings are part of San Francisco's architectural legacy. More specifically, they are symbolic of the San Francisco Public Library, dedicated to free and equal access to information, knowledge, independent learning and the joys of reading for our diverse community. The Branch Library Improvement Bond Program of November 2000 is a once-in-a-lifetime opportunity on the scale of the 1901 Carnegie Library Grant Program to distinguish this community-based legacy for the next generation.

In order to shape the way the Bond Program will promote excellent design, and in recognition and celebration of the creative diversity of San Francisco, we are establishing the following Design Excellence Program. This program will focus the way the City selects architects and engineers for its Bond Program projects. It concentrates the selection process on design excellence, opening up opportunities for emerging talent, and women / minority owned disadvantaged businesses. This program will raise the bar by subjecting work to the peer advisor process. And this program will allow for integration of the public in the design process through a series of mandated community & Commission forums.

Federal and State agencies have tested this approach. Local success, however, will be measured by the degree of participation and commitment by the public and the design industry. Consider this an invitation to the San Francisco community at large to contribute to outstanding, cost-effective, and enduring architecture dedicated to the mission of the San Francisco Public Library system.

Charles A. Higuera, AIA, Library Commission President

Luis Herrera, City Librarian

Marilyn M. Thompson, AIA, Bond Program Manager

INTRODUCTION

The Design Excellence Program (DEP) is being instituted specifically for the Proposition A, November 2000, Branch Library Improvement Bond Program. This bond measure is an unprecedented opportunity for the San Francisco Public Library system the likes of which we may not see for another generation. The DEP will be administered by the Bond Program Manager hired by the San Francisco Public Library (SFPL). The principle goals of the Program are: (1) producing facilities that reflect the mission of SFPL; (2) emphasizing designs that embody the finest architectural thought; and (3) creating synergy with staff and neighborhoods. The DEP is manifested in three areas:

A/E Selection- To find the most creative talent, the selection of consulting architects will be according to design first, opening up the field for emerging talent. The first stage of an architect/engineer (A/E) selection will be based on the evaluation of portfolios. Emphasis will be on function, artistic ability and value. For independent new structures & complex projects, a third stage shall be considered, a design competition. This strategy will emphasize quality design and allow for project teams tailored to each project.

Design Review- To benefit from the insights and expertise of professionals and ensure state-of-the-art thinking, the Branch Library Improvement Program will involve distinguished private-sector architects, interior designers, and planners in a design peer review capacity. Two-member panels will be appointed to peer review designs at completion of schematic design phase.

Public Review Process- To create synergy with the neighborhood, a public review process will be followed for each project, which represents the minimum requirements for community interaction. Responsive responsible design is an expectation of every design team, including the ability to achieve feasible, generally accepted designs from staff, administration and community while meeting budget and schedule requirements. "Design by committee", uniformity and mimicry of historic styles, however, are discouraged.

This guide will outline the three critical elements of the DEP and provide an overview of each process— A/E selection, design review and public review process—with a step-by-step guide for implementing it.

Consistent use of this guide will ensure fairness, maintain integrity of the process and promote respect for excellent design that is crucial to any successful project.

GOALS & OBJECTIVES

1. The policy shall be to provide facilities in an architectural style and form which reflects the mission of the San Francisco Public Library: “dedicated to free and equal access to information, knowledge, independent learning and the joys of reading for our diverse community”. The functional accommodation of information access and independent learning should be inherent in the designs. Space planning efficiencies which lead to quicker return of collections to the shelf and increased staff / public interaction should be realized. A physical manifestation of the “joy of reading” should be evident. Evoking the identity, vernacular and salient architectural characteristics of the neighborhood through consideration of form and materials should be evident. Public art, where required & appropriate, should be integrated into the architecture rather than placed adjacent to it or added as an afterthought. The Design Excellence Program is not intended to displace, monitor or establish design requirements, industry standards, value engineering concepts, standard of care definitions, or Quality Assurance Programs of the City. Nor will the Design Excellence Program substitute or usurp mandated requirements of Civic Design Review, Art Enrichment Program, Landmarks Preservation Advisory Board, City Planning, and other regulatory agencies.
2. Major emphasis should be placed on designs that embody the most state-of-the-art architectural thought. Form + Function + Value. Styles, uniformity, and standardization must be avoided. Competitions, charrettes and workshops may be held where appropriate. The advice of distinguished architects, interior designers, and planners shall be sought. Sustainable building practices shall be considered.
3. The public review process outlined herein shall be followed as a minimum gesture. The design team shall conduct as many community and staff meetings as needed to satisfy their design responsibility. The process shall be tailored for each project and each neighborhood. Recognizing that consensus may be difficult, recognizing that inclusion in the decision-making process breeds understanding, and advocating that synergy creates good design, each design team shall adopt a process that identifies and includes its stakeholders. In addition, the concept of design shall extend beyond the boundaries of the property line and beyond the edges of the building, considering the context and urban design ramifications.

A/E SELECTION PROCESS

Renovations & Additions- Requests for Qualifications (RFQ) for private sector design teams may be issued in two to three year intervals, each establishing a pool of qualified Architecture / Engineering (A/E) teams for City's use. A selection will be made after a two-stage process involving Portfolio Evaluations and Interviews. Projects may be assigned to the listed A/E Teams in order of importance according to the final ranking or by best match of design team qualifications with project requirements or by previous performance, at the City's discretion.

New Construction & Complex Projects- RFQs for private sector design teams may be issued as a project becomes active or when site selection is complete. A three-stage process of Portfolio Evaluation, Interviews and Design Competition should be considered to select the A/E team.

The A/E selection process is structured to find a designer, not the design. In the case of a three stage process, the design concepts submitted are simply responses to the RFQ criteria and may or may not be an appropriate solution. Competition submittals are giving insight into the Designer's approach rather than providing program, site, and technical requirements for the project.

General Regulations

Each RFQ shall fully describe the process, restrictions and decision-making criteria to avoid protests and unnecessary delays. More than one RFQ will be issued during the course of the Branch Library Improvement Bond Program. The success or failure of previous work performed for San Francisco Public Library will be considered in the evaluations. A Memorandum of Understanding between the Library and Public Works establishes a decision-making process for determining the need for an RFQ.

The City will preside over the selection process and make selections. The RFQ shall describe the selection process and City's rights and options. All City regulations will be described in the RFQ, as applicable at time of issuance. The Bond Program's standard consultant agreement shall be attached to each RFQ to indicate starting point for any subsequent contract negotiations.

Eligibility Requirements

Architects and engineers must be licensed in California. In addition, Business Tax License, Human Rights Commission Certification, Insurance, Domestic Partners Coverage and other City requirements will be necessary in order to submit proposals and enter into contracts with the City. The RFQ will outline eligibility requirements applicable at time of issuance.

Panels, Juries and Selection Committees

Juries, Panels and Selection Committees are passive meeting bodies. Deliberations and schedules are procurement sensitive and will not be revealed until after selections are made. Members shall be drawn from City, State, Federal and private sectors, including educators, public officials and practicing designers. Names may be released immediately before Interviews and Competitions. Members will refrain from discussing their deliberations until final rankings are issued. Each member and advisor must sign a "Conflict of Interest Affidavit, which states that no person may serve if that person or any member of that person's family has any direct financial or employment interest in any of the firms being evaluated.

Each member of a Panel, Jury or Selection Committee should have expertise pertinent to the particular project(s) and should have in-depth knowledge of the particular discipline or representation requested. The City will strive to combine expertise to achieve balance and allow members to learn from each other. Each member should respect the views of his/her fellow members. Members should be individuals of similar standing in their respective fields. Open, curious minds, candid discussion, and collaboration will be supported. Members are responsible to independently evaluate and rate candidates using the criteria published in the RFQ.

The City selects Panel, Jury and Selection Committee members, manages the interviews and competitions, and coordinates all logistics.

Advertising & Announcements

The RFQs will be publicly advertised as required by City Charter. In addition, RFQs should be announced in design magazines and local architectural and engineering professional organizations in order to ensure maximum participation of the design community. Announcements should also be posted in the branch libraries, Main Library and website.

Stage I: Portfolio Evaluations

In Stage I, the City will solicit design portfolios from Prime Consultants. Portfolios will be evaluated and a short-list will be invited to participate in Stage II. The goal of Stage I is to short-list the best Prime Consultants based on design. Design Firms shall identify a Lead Designer and submit examples from his/her portfolio along with recently completed work by the firm. However, HRC will require the entire Design Team is compiled at the outset. Sub-consultant goals must be complied with in Stage I. All submissions must comply with the City's M/WBE program administered by the Human Rights Commission in order to be evaluated.

Steps in Stage I:

- **Public Advertisement.**
- **Pre-Proposal Meeting.**

To orient those interested in the RFQ, a meeting will be held at a publicly accessible location in the City. This is a meeting to answer questions about the project(s) and the selection process and to network with possible joint venture partners. HRC, representatives of the Library and DPW will be present. Attendance will not be mandatory, but is considered a good faith effort for purposes of HRC compliance.
- **Submission of Portfolios.**

A Design Portfolio of work from the Lead Designer and Design Firm is requested first. The Lead Designer may be more than one person. The Lead Designer may be an individual, a studio, or collaboration of individuals from the Design Firm. Lead Designers will be evaluated according to the portfolio and previous work for SFPL. The Design Firm (prime) may be one firm or a joint venture. The portfolio must contain only the information requested in the RFQ. No other information will be accepted. Incomplete Portfolios will not be evaluated. The following minimum information should be requested:

 1. Documentation of three outstanding projects by the Lead Designer.
 2. A written statement of design philosophy, understanding of the design issues, and design approach.
 3. Biographical information of the Lead Designer
 4. Documentation of three outstanding projects by the Design Firm.
 5. Previous work with City.
- **Evaluation of Portfolios by Selection Committee.**

Design Firms and Lead Designers will be evaluated by a Committee based on their portfolio submission and any previous work for SFPL. The Committee will submit scores to the City.
- **Application of Bid Preferences.**

The City's Human Rights Commission (HRC) applies bid preferences. Note that rankings may change after application of preferences.
- **Short-Listing.**

The City will issue a Short-list as specified in the RFQ. Short-listed Design Teams will be invited to participate in Stage II.

Stage II: Design Team Interviews

In Stage II, the Design Teams short-listed in Stage I are interviewed. Design Teams may be asked to submit additional supporting material to demonstrate capability, responsibility, and commitment. An Interview Panel scores the Design Teams, considering both interviews and any supporting material. Stage II is slightly different for New Construction & Complex Projects than for Renovations & Additions, as noted below.

Steps in Stage II:

- **Announcement of & Invitations to Stage II.**
- **Submission of Supporting Material.**

Each Team must submit supporting material in the format described by the RFQ, which could include profiling the team's organization, qualifications, and past projects and references. Only complete supporting materials will be forwarded to the Interview Panel.
- **Juried Interviews.**

The Interview Panel will interview each Design Team. The Interview Panel may or may not consist of the same members as the Stage I Committee. Interviews will be attended by HRC. Interviewees should be prepared to respond to questions, be able to clarify supporting material, and complete their presentations within a fixed time period. The interview should focus on the Design Team, such as Lead Designer's relationship to the team, and the capability of the Team to develop the design in a timely and responsible manner. Evaluation criteria will be given in the RFQ.
- **Scoring of Design Teams by Interview Panel.**

The Interview Panel will score the Design Team. The Interview Panel will consider the supporting material as well as the interviews. Scoring criteria will be published in the RFQ.
- **Application of Bid Preferences.**

HRC applies bid preferences. Note that rankings may change after application of preferences.
- **Final Ranking Released (two stage process).**

The final ranking will be released. The top ranked firms will be selected for the pool of Design Teams available for assignment, as designated in the RFQ. Projects will be assigned at City's discretion. Not all firms in the pool will be guaranteed assignments. Not all sub-consultants will be guaranteed work of any magnitude. Work will be contracted as necessary due to the particular nature of a project. Additional specialized consultants may be necessary due to the particular nature of a project. Supporting material demonstrating capability, responsibility and commitment will be required of any additional consultants for approval by the City.
- **Competition Short-list released (three stage process).**

The Stage II ranking will be released. The RFQ will designate the number of Design Teams that will be invited to participate in Stage III.
- **Assurance of Compliance & Issuance of Purchase Orders (three stage process).**

Each Design Team advancing to Stage III may have to comply with City vendor requirements in order to receive the stipend. If top ranked Design Teams from Stage II are not compliant, the City may elect to include the next ranked Design Team.

Stage III: Competition

The goal of Stage III is to have invited Design Teams prepare a "vision" for a particular project. The City will select the Design Team based on the Stage III evaluation of design concepts by an independent jury. The top ranked Design Teams from Stage II compete for the final selection. A stipend will be paid to participating Design Teams not awarded a contract.

The Vision Competition is a tool to test the Design Team's response to basic budget, functional & technical requirements, ability to integrate the facility into its context, proposed image to be conveyed, and ability to work together.

The Design Teams will participate in a short, maximum 10-day, design competition. They are compensated for their design services with a nominal stipend. The Design Teams will respond to the program and site as described in the Vision Competition package, illustrating their "vision" of the project. An Independent Jury evaluates the design concepts. The Jury should not know which competitors created which designs, a "blind competition". The Jury will consist primarily of voting design professionals and may also have non-voting community members and non-voting library staff members. The community may be included in the competition scoring process.

The City may weigh substantially the Jury evaluation (at least 50%) along with the Stage II final ranking to make the final selection or use Jury rankings with bid preferences to determine final selection. The RFQ should describe selection process and criteria.

Steps in Stage III are:

- **Pre-Competition Briefing.**

Each invited Design Team will be given a Competition Package at the briefing describing the process, the evaluation and the required submittals. The Pre-Competition Briefing will be an open session to review procedures, design guidelines, space program, site information, and other project-specific criteria. This session should be attended by representatives of each Design Team and include the Lead Designer. The City will respond to questions at the briefing.
- **Competition Period.**

Participating Teams can submit written questions and requests for additional information to the City. All questions received will be answered promptly, and written copies of all questions and answers will be sent simultaneously to each participating Team. Anonymity of the source of questions will be maintained in the written responses.
- **Submission of Competition Entries.**

Each participating Team will have a period of at most 10 days to prepare and submit its design concept. The “vision” should reflect a free-flowing graphic expression that explores what the facility could be. The “vision” submission, which may include drawings and written materials, shall be delivered to the place and time, on the date and to the address specified. Each Team will be responsible for making their submittal on time. Non-conforming submittals will not be accepted and stipends will not be paid unless a submittal is made. Competition entries should list all participants and must include the Lead Designer.
- **Evaluation of Competition Entries.**

Upon receipt, the City will evaluate each submission to ensure compliance. Only those submissions that, in the sole judgment of the City, meet specified criteria will be passed on to an Independent Jury for consideration. The Jury may or may not consist of the same members as the Stage I Committee and / or the Stage II Interview Panel. The Jury will review, analyze, and discuss the design concepts. Jury may assign points according to criteria, or may only select a winner, as specified in the RFQ. Community votes may be considered in addition to Jury rankings. If competition entries are publicly displayed, a “gag order” shall be enforced for participants. Only San Francisco residents shall be allowed to submit votes.
- **Selection of Design Team.**

The City may use Jury rankings or weigh substantially (at least 50%) the jury selection and add this to the Stage II final rankings to determine the final score. The RFQ will describe. HRC will apply bid preferences to the final score to determine final selection.
- **Final Ranking Released (three stage process).**
- **Awarding of Design Contract.**

The City will enter into negotiations with the selected Design Team. In the event the City is unable, for any reason, to enter into an agreement with the selected Design Team, the City reserves the right to terminate discussions without incurring any liability to any member of the Design Team and proceed to negotiate with the second ranked firm. For regulations governing negotiations and contract award, reference City Charter and Administrative Code and the RFQ at time of issuance. The RFQ should contain a standard consultant agreement that will be used as a starting point for contract negotiations. The City reserves the right to modify this agreement to reflect specific project needs in the negotiation process after final selection.

DESIGN REVIEW

Panels of private-sector peers will assist the City in its responsibility to oversee the development of the projects by participating in design reviews. Each panel will consist of two members, an architect and a library professional. Each design review will consist of one meeting with architect & fellow panelists, and one public critique to the Library Commission. Peer panelists will serve voluntarily without compensation.

Roles and Responsibilities of the Private-Sector Peers

As highly respected professionals, the peers' advice and insights are invaluable to those responsible for the design of the project. In this context, the peers take on the following critical roles:

Educator: Many other individuals involved in the project are not architects or designers and usually are not familiar with design language or the nature of the design process. By sharing their expertise through critique, helping non-designers interpret design proposals and identifying potential design options, peers help facilitate a full, open, and constructive discussion to reach the best design solutions possible.

Advocate: With any significant public architectural project there exists a multitude of perspectives from clients and users. Because of practical limitations, not all these stakeholders can participate in the design review process. The peers, as objective experts, can help represent voices and issues not otherwise present. This could include being advocates for the functional work environment, the urban and public context, or the long-term ecological and environmental impacts of design decisions. It is important to advocate design excellence, elevating the discourse and inhibiting a lowest common denominator conclusion on the design of any one project.

Provocateur: As professionals, the peers have a responsibility to express openly and fairly their best judgments based on expert knowledge and extensive experience. As non-stakeholders, they are in a position to ask sensitive, but pointed, questions that City staff and client representatives may be reluctant or unable to ask or examine. As individuals not intimately involved in the project, the peers help address misperceptions and hidden assumptions to ensure that all potential issues are fully explored and evaluated.

Consensus builder: The peers, as neutral parties, can play a pivotal role in focusing the discussion and creating an environment that encourages everyone to speak. They can help build consensus on what design quality is and keep everyone focused on quality concerns. Peers, by training and experience, are able to synthesize various views and articulate the best choices when opinions differ.

Communicator: Design reviews can easily conclude with everyone having expressed opinions but nobody knowing what it all means. Often a discussion has evolved into an imprecise consensus. The peers can help the group develop specific conclusions and leave the session with objectives, decisions, and concerns that can provide cogent insight, caution, and direction for the design team.

Process

A Design Review Session will be held when Schematic Design Phase is complete, wherein the project is publicly presented to the Library Commission by the A/E team and the peer panel gives their critique. The Design Review Session will help the Commission determine adequacy and appropriateness of the project design. The presented design may proceed into Design Development Phase if found to be acceptable. A/E team may also be required to return to the Library Commission to respond to comments made by the Peer Panel, Commission and Public at the Design Review Session.

The quality of a project's design review is improved if peer feedback is timely, constructive and candid. To encourage this, peers should review community meeting notes, correspondence, and news items related to the project, review progress drawings and, if possible, attend the project's community forums (2 minimum per project). The A/E Team will show the recommended schematic design to the peers and peers will subsequently discuss their critique amongst themselves before the Design Review Session. This time should be used by the peers to establish clear recommendations for the A/E team. A/E team may elect to revise designs in advance of the Design Review Session.

Logistics

Private-sector peer participation will be coordinated by the Bond Program Manager. Peers will serve uncompensated, and cannot have open contracts, either as sub-consultant or prime, on any of the A/E teams used by the Bond Program while serving as peers. The Bond Program Manager will seek recommendations and advice from local chapters of relevant professional organizations and receive letters of interest from prospective peer panelists. The Bond Program Manager will establish the Peer Panels and maintain a list of available peers who have agreed to serve. The Bond Program Manager will be responsible for providing the peers with appropriate background materials, program objectives, and design information on the project. The Bond Program Manager will coordinate logistics.

Qualifications & Desirable Traits

Peer candidates shall be highly respected in their fields. It is desirable that peer panelists live in San Francisco or be familiar with its neighborhoods and communities. Peer panelists shall not have any conflict of interest and will be required to sign an affidavit attesting to this. Peer candidates will submit a resume or bio verifying their experience and standing in one of the three fields or disciplines requested, including a list of publications & awards. It is desirable that candidates submit a letter of interest attesting to commitment & availability, understanding of terms & conflict of interest, and answering the question: "Why do you want to participate in design review of San Francisco's Branch Library Improvements?"

PUBLIC REVIEW PROCESS

In order for the Library Commission and SFPL Administration to adequately respond to the sheer number and complexity of projects in the Bond Program and fully understand community concerns, every project must comply with a minimum process of public review as set forth below. This is in addition to regularly scheduled Library Commission meetings with monthly budget, schedule & progress reports. This is in addition to regulatory agency requirements, Board of Supervisors oversight requirements, general obligation bond requirements and public contracting code requirements. The process is meant to be meaningful and to heighten the awareness of the design team, not to suggest “design by committee” or to lower expectations to a common denominator.

Public reviews will occur at community-based forums and at indicated Library Commission meetings. All such meetings and forums shall be publicly noticed and in an accessible location within the City. Community forums shall be held in the branch library if possible. Notes will be taken at community forums and made available to the public & the Commission within one month. Public review shall occur at the following stages of design & construction, at a minimum:

Planning: At completion of a community assessment, at least one community forum will be held to discuss the library service needs of the community, the plans to address those needs, and the resultant building program necessary to provide those services, within budgetary & technical parameters (ie: historical, structural, ADA). The presentation may include charts describing programs & collections, adjacency diagrams, bubble diagrams, and square footage allocations. The purpose of the forum is to collect public input and comment for incorporation into the design as appropriate.

Conceptual Design: At completion of programming, at least one community forum will be held to present the final program and multiple conceptual plans to the community. The presentation may include options with pros & cons, sketches & diagrams, rough-order-of-magnitude estimates, and responses to previous public comment. The purpose of the forum is to collect public input and comment for incorporation into the design as appropriate.

Schematic Design: At completion of conceptual design, the final recommended schematic plans shall be presented to the Library Commission. The Peer Panel will provide their critique. The community and general public may submit comment. The presentation may include floor plans, elevations, sections, model, site plan, estimate, and responses to previous public comment. The purpose is to review the design and determine if the A/E Team may proceed into Design Development. The Library Commission may elect at this point to re-design and/or to require additional community forum(s).

Construction Documents: At 90% completion of construction documents, before bid, the project shall be presented to the Library Commission. The community and general public may submit comment. The presentation may include detailed drawings, specifications, detailed cost estimate, quality assurance reviews, value engineering recommendations, add-alternate bid items and regulatory agency approvals. The purpose is to determine the appropriateness of the project to be issued for bid.

Bid: Upon receipt of bid, the project shall be presented to the Library Commission. The community and general public may submit comment. The presentation shall include the bid tabulation. The purpose is to discuss the appropriateness to proceed into construction and the award of alternates, if any. The Commission’s discussion is will not determine lowest responsive responsible bidder.

Construction: At Substantial Completion, the project shall be presented to the Library Commission. The community and general public may submit comment. The presentation may include summary reports on progress of work, change orders and payments, the punch-list, and project financial report. The purpose is to discuss the appropriateness of closing out the construction contract and how to allocate remaining funds, if any.

Close out: At Final Completion, the project shall be presented to the Library Commission. The community and general public may submit comment. The presentation shall be a final tally of all expenditures on the project. The purpose is to allocate remaining funds or appropriate additional funds, as indicated.

B2. SFPL Gift Recognition Policy

San Francisco Public Library Commission Policy Manual

Gift Recognition Policy

Policy #602

Section: Facilities

Adopted: March 21, 2002

Revised: draft for approval July 20, 2006

Whereas, on November 7, 2000, the people of San Francisco approved Proposition A, a \$105.8 million bond measure, to fund the acquisition, construction and renovation of neighborhood branch libraries and other library facilities; and

Whereas, Proposition A bond funds by law cannot be used to purchase furniture, fixtures, equipment, and materials needed for the new and renovated neighborhood branch libraries; and

Whereas, the Friends of the San Francisco Public Library, through its Neighborhood Library Campaign, is committed to raising \$16 million to purchase the needed furniture, fixtures, equipment, and materials not provided for in the passage of Proposition A (2000); and

Whereas, the San Francisco Public Library Commission wishes to recognize the generosity of the Friends and its donors by offering suitable and appropriate opportunities for recognition at branch libraries; and

Whereas, the Friends have developed uniform gifting guidelines and standards for the format, design and location of donor recognition plaques for designated categories of gifts suited to the building architecture at historic and contemporary branches in a document entitled "SFPL Branch Library Donor Recognition Standards 7-2006" ("Standards"), a copy of which is on file with the Secretary of the San Francisco Public Library Commission, and incorporated herein;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that any and all neighborhood branch libraries of the San Francisco Public Library may display such plaques or other forms of donor recognition as the City Librarian shall deem appropriate to honor the Friends and contributors to the Friends Neighborhood Library Campaign; and

MAY IT BE FURTHER RESOLVED that the City Librarian may approve any and all plaques that conform to the Standards provided that the San Francisco Public Library Commission reserves the right, in consultation with the Friends, to approve the permanent location of all donor recognition plaques as part of its ultimate oversight authority over each neighborhood branch library construction or renovation project; and

MAY IT BE FURTHER RESOLVED that any such plaques or other forms of donor recognition to honor the Friends and contributors to the Friends Neighborhood Library Campaign approved and installed as provided herein shall be displayed for the useful life of the furnishings, equipment or facility, or thirty (30) years, whichever shall first occur. After the thirty year period has ended, the San Francisco Public Library Commission may rename any furnishings, equipment or facility and remove any Neighborhood Library Campaign donor recognition plaques, provided that the Library maintains a suitable permanent record of the prior honorees; and

MAY IT BE FURTHER RESOLVED that the San Francisco Public Library Commission reserves the right to resite or remove any Neighborhood Library Campaign donor recognition plaques or other forms of donor recognition if it becomes a hazard or liability or if a pledge or other terms of the underlying donation are not fulfilled.